UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/553,967	04/21/2000	Sai V. Allavarpu	5181-48700	6558

7590 03/09/2004	**EXAMINER**
Robert C Kowert	TRAN, TONGOC
Conley Rose & Tayon PC	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

P O Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 April 2000_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-52_ is/are pending in the application.
  4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-52_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _2,5,6_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This office action is in response to applicants' application no. 09/953967 filed on 4/21/2000.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/31/2002, 11/13/2003 and

11/18/2003 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-24, 26-31, 33-41, 43-49, and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Hu (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,260).

In respect to claim 1, Hu discloses a network management system comprising:

a client-side authentication library deployed on one or more client computer

systems, wherein the client-side authentication library comprises a client side interface which is

operable to retrieve and encrypt a user profile associated with a user, and wherein the client-side

library is implemented for one or more client platforms respectively corresponding to each of the one

or more client computer systems (see col. 2. lines 1-19 and col. 5, lines 4-19); and

a server-side authentication library deployed on a server computer system coupled to the client

computer system, wherein the server-side authentication library comprises a server-side interface

which is operable to receive the encrypted user profile from the client-side authentication library and

decrypt the user profile to authenticate the user for one or more network services, and wherein the server-side library is implemented for a server platform corresponding to the server computer system (see 4, line 59-col. 5, line 19).

Hu does not explicitly disclose the client-side and server-side libraries are implemented in accordance with a platform-independent interface specification. However, using platform-independent interface specification is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature with Hu's authentication system in a distributed network where different objects (users or resources) across the network with different platforms can interact with each other.

In respect to claim 2, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1, wherein the client-side authentication library is shared by a plurality of management applications (see col. 5, lines 4-19).

In respect to claim 3, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1, wherein the server-side authentication library is shared by a plurality of gateway components (see col. 5, lines 4-19).

In respect to claim 4, Hu disclose the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not explicitly disclose wherein the server-side authentication library is implemented in C++. However, implementing C++ programming language in server-side is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize C++ for the server because of the language's object-oriented features and its stability.

In respect to claim 5, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1, wherein the user profile comprises a user name and a password (see col. 4, lines 28-32).

In respect to claim 6, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 5, wherein the user profile further comprises a designation of a management information server (MIS) to which the user wishes to connect (see col. 1, lines 16-19).

In respect to claims 7 and 9, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not disclose wherein the platform-independent interface specification comprises a specification expressed in an interface definition language (IDL), wherein the interface definition language is operable to define object interfaces across a plurality of platforms and across a plurality of programming languages; wherein the client-side authentication library and the server-side authentication library are operable to authenticate requests received by a CORBA gateway, wherein the requests comprise management requests to one or more managed objects, and wherein the management requests are sent by one or more manager applications. However, Implementing CORBA and IDL in a distributed network environment are old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Hu's authentication system between a client and a server in a distributed networking environment with CORBA and IDL for its supports for interacting with distributed objects across the network regardless of where or what platform the objects are located.

In respect to claims 10 and 11, Hu discloses a network management system comprising:

a gateway which is coupled to one or more managers, wherein the gateway is configured to provide network management services to the one or more managers; and one or more pluggable authentication modules which are operable to provide authentication of a manager based upon a user profile, wherein the user

profile corresponds to a user of one of the managers, and wherein the one or more pluggable

authentication modules are accessible by the gateway and the one or more managers; and wherein

the gateway is configurable to authenticate the user to receive the network management services

using the pluggable authentication modules (see col. 2, lines 1-19 and col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 19).

Hu does not explicitly disclose the authentication modules are implemented in accordance with

a platform-independent interface specification. However, using platform-independent interface

specification is old and well known. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to incorporate this feature with Hu's authentication system in a

distributed network where different objects (users or resources) across the network with different

platforms can interact with each other.

In respect to claims 12-13 and 15-17, the claim limitations are substantially similar to claims 1,

5-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 12-3, and 15-17 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 18-24 and 26, the claim limitations are method claims that are substantially

similar to system claims 1-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 18-26 are rejected based on the similar

rationale.

In respect to claims 27-31 and 33-34, the claim limitations are method claims that are

substantially similar to system claims 10-13, 15-17. Therefore, claims 27-31 and 33-34 are rejected

based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 35-41 and 43, the claim limitations are computer programmable medium

claims that are substantially similar to system claims 1-7 and 9. Therefore, claims 35-41 and 43 are

rejected based on the similar rationale.

In respect to claims 44-49 and 51-52, the claim limitations are computer programmable

medium claims that are substantially similar to system claims 10-13 and 15-17. Therefore, claims 44-

49 and 51-52 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

4.   Claims 8, 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Hu (U.S. Patent No. 5,586,260) in view of Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,050).

In respect to claim 8, Hu discloses the network management system of claim 1. Hu does not

explicitly disclose wherein the user profile is encrypted and decrypted according to a user-selected

encryption scheme. However, Thompson discloses encryption scheme is selected according to

user's preference (see col. 4, lines 4-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Hu's encrypting user

profile with Thompson's user-selected encryption scheme according to the different types of data or

user's preference (Thompson, col. 4, lines 4-12).

In respect to claims 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50, the claim limitations are substantially similar to

claim 8. Therefore claims 14, 25, 32, 42 and 50 are rejected based on the similar rationale.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

-Raduchel et al. Disclose a network-based authentication of computer user.

-Grantges, Jr. discloses a secure gateway having user identification and password

authentication.

-Garrison discloses a system and method for restricting unauthorized access to a database.

-Morgan et al. Disclose a security method and system for persistent storage and

communication on compute network system and computer network system employing the same.

-Blanco et al. Disclose a network access authentication system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Tongoc Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-7690. The examiner can

normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Gregory A. Morse can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained

from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available

through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner: Tongoc Tran
Art Unit: 2134

TT

March 5, 2004

MATTHEW SMITHERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Art Unit 2137